

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of

Application No. : 10/626,148
Docket No. : 058420-00005
Applicant : Ciano et al.
Filed : July 24, 2003
Title : REWARD SYSTEM
Art Unit : 3714
Examiner : Matthew D. Hoel

Filed via EFS

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview which took place on May 7, 2009. In that interview, it was discussed how the claims may be amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. For example, it was discussed that, while method claim 1 already specifies that the tracking step is carried out by a computer, claim 1 may be amended to specify that the receiving step is carried out by a computer, and that the tracking step is also carried out by the computer. Amending claim 26 to include an element for providing the reward to the customer was also discussed. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the cases of *Ex parte Cornea-Hasegan* (Appeal No. 2008-4742; B.P.A.I. 2009) and *Ex parte Halligan* (Appeal No. 2008-1588; B.P.A.I. 2008) may be particularly instructive in addressing the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 in this application.

In discussing the rejections over the prior art, Applicant pointed out that the Office action appears to take the position that the Gardenswartz reference can be interpreted such that a new "value contract" offered under that system constitutes a "reward." Accordingly, it was discussed

Serial No. 10/626,148
Attorney Docket No. 058420-0005
Interview Summary

that claim 1 might be amended to specify that the tracking step is carried out for a given cycle of the reward program.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven J. Elleman/
Steven J. Elleman
Reg. No. 41,733

THOMPSON HINE LLP
2000 Courthouse Plaza NE
10 West Second Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402
(937) 443-6838

575686.1